

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are rejected. Claims 5, 6, 11 and 12 are allowed. Claims 1, 2, and 8-10 are amended herein. Claim 7 is cancelled. No new matter is added.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the JP7-27430 ('430) reference. Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added) . It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is deficient with regard to the following.

Claims 1, 2, and 8-10 are amended to recite "a supporting member having a cylindrical wall with portions provided thereon supporting the bridging member at a plurality of positions around a bridging member axis without establishing contact around an entire circumference of the bridging member." The Supporting

member was previously introduced in claim 2 and is now introduced in claim 1. This construction of a supporting member is not shown by the '430 reference.

Fig.10 of the '430 is cited by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection analysis misapplies elements of the claims onto the device of Fig. 10. The rejection reads the "bridging member" of claim 1, recited as extending from the inner container, on the "crisscross metal clasps 9 of the outer container 2" of the Fig. 10 embodiment. It appears the Examiner broadly reads the claim language "the inner container having a bridging member" to include the crisscross clasp 9 of Fig. 10. However, the clasp 9 actually is merely slid into the "cylinder metal clasps 6" and does not extend from the inner container.

It is further submitted that the rejection analysis clearly breaks down with regard to claim 2 because it reads the "supporting member," which is now recited in the claim 1 as being part of the outer container and having a cylindrical wall, on the clasps 6 which, as noted above, slidably accept the crisscross clasps 9 which the Examiner reads as extending from the inner container. The analysis is flawed because the Examiner reading of the "supporting member" of the outer container on the clasps 6 contradicts the reading of claim 1 elements on the embodiment of Fig. 10. Claim 1 requires that the bridging member extend from the inner container. The Examiner cannot then read the bridging member on the "crisscross clasp 9 " because the "crisscross clasps 9" extends from the clasps 6 in Fig. 10 of

the '430 reference and the rejection reads clasps 6 as being part of the outer container, not the inner container. Either the clasps 6 cannot be support for the "supporting member" of the claims or the "crisscross clasps 9" cannot be support for the "bridging member" of the claims.

Still further, the rejections are flawed in that claim 3 requires the "bridging member" extend from a bottom of the inner container. This is clearly not consistent with the embodiment of Fig. 10 of the '430 reference if the "bridging member" is read on the "crisscross clasps 9."

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that the reference fails to teach the presently claimed supporting member "having a cylindrical wall with portions provided thereon supporting the bridging member at a plurality of positions around a bridging member axis without establishing contact around an entire circumference of the bridging member."

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 and 8-10 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-3 and 8-10 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 4 is rejected as obvious over the '430 reference in view of the Skinner reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that the proffered combination of references cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the secondary Skinner reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to the anticipation rejection that is absent from the primary '430 reference. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 4 and its allowance are respectfully requested.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER OBJECTIONS**

Claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent from rejected base claims. The Examiner indicates that the claims contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if put in independent form incorporating the limitations of the base and intervening claims. Claim 11 is amended in accordance with the

Examiner's suggestion and claim 12 depends from claim 11. Reconsideration of the objection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### CLAIM FEES

One further independent claim in excess of three is added. Accordingly, please charge the fee of \$200 to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

The PTO did not receive the following  
listed Item(s) The Credit card  
Form -

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants

By and,

By H. F. Ruschmann  
Herbert F. Ruschmann  
Reg. No. 35,341  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340